28. Need for expunging certain portions of the Report of the Jenmi-Kudiyan Committee.

Mr. Trivikraman Vasudevan (Member, Jenmi, Padmanabhapuram Division) said that certain portions of the Report of the Jenmi-Kudiyan Committee were specially pointed out at the last session of the Assembly as being highly objectionable and prejudicial to the status and reputation of the Jenmis as a community and regretted that no action had been taken either to call the author of the Report to account or to expunge those portions. He repeated the same request and submitted that the objectionable portions had caused great pain and lowered the Jenmis in the eyes of the public in general. He, therefore, prayed that immediate action be taken to omit the portions and thus redress a great wrong done to the community.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

29. The Report of the Jenmi-Kudiyan Committee and the draft Bill.

Mr. Narayanan Janardanan (Member, Jenmi, Trivandrum Division) said that he had nothing to add to what had been stated by the Padmanabhapuram Member.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

30. Amendment of the Nair Regulation.

Mr. K. Parameswaran Pillai B. A. & B. L. (Member, Trivandrum Taluk) submitted that, though the Nair Regulation made sufficient provision for securing to the Nair *Tarawads* the *corpus* of the *Tarawad* properties, little or nothing had been done to secure to the members of a family reasonable use of the income of the family. The *Karanavan* was practically the master and sole owner of the *Tarawad* income and he need not keep an account of the same. He was not bound to maintain the *Tarawad* members except in the family house, unless any member was living outside with the consent of the *Karanavan* or for justifiable reasons. Even in the family, he was not bound to make an equal or adequate distribution of the family income. In fact, the chances of a junior member getting adequate benefit out of the *Tarawad* income depended, to a great extent, on the whims and caprices of the *Karanavan*. The junior members of even the most wealthy and respectable *Tarawads* were very often in the position of loafers or hangers-on, especially when the *Karanavan* was but remotely related to them. The problem to be solved was, how were the junior members to get a reasonable and adequate benefit out of the *Tarawad* income? If the liability to account was not imposed on *Karanavans*, the remedy must depend on the right of the junior members to demand partition. The question was, no doubt, beset with difficulties and there was much to be said on both sides.

Dewan.—I am glad that you realize the difficulties. As a matter of fact, it is one of the most difficult questions to decide and I fully agree in your view that there is much to be said on both sides.

The Member, continuing, said that, in his opinion, individual partition would be the best arrangement. But until partition was allowed, something ought to be done to minimise the disabilities of junior members in Nair *Tarawads* and he suggested that provision might be made to enable *thavazhees* to claim an allotment of a reasonable portion of the *Tarawad* properties for maintenance without the power of alienation, the allotment being subject to revision when the condition of the *Tarawad* was substantially altered.

Dewan.—Is there any High Court decision on the point in the T. L. R. ?

Member.—No, Sir, but the High Court is presided over by judges possessing very liberal views on the subject. In suits for maintenance, the slightest reasons are considered sufficient for granting maintenance.

Dewan.—I think that the Madras High Court has recently passed a decision according to which female members, and even male members living apart from the *Tarawad*, are entitled to maintenance.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly